

REMARKS

Support for the amendment of claim 1 is in original dependent claim 10. Support for newly represented independent claim 32 is original claim 7 dependent on original claim 1. Support for newly represented independent claim 33 is original claim 26 dependent on original claim 1. Claims 24 and 25 are canceled.

Claims 1-6, 10 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ylitalo et al. (WO 99/55537). According to the Examiner:

Applicants claim a medium including an array of three-dimensional cells composed of hydrophobic cell walls and a hydrophilic base, wherein the cell walls comprise a material that is capable of being fused. Ylitalo discloses a receptor medium comprising an embossed imaging surface. See Abstract. The embossed surface comprises an array of cavities having walls and a base. See p 10, 11, 19-22 and FIG. 1. The cells are formed by embossing a plastic film such as polyester. See p 13 1 24 through p 14, 1 18. Polyester is a material listed by applicants on page 9 of the application as being capable of fusing. Ylitalo further discloses that a surfactant is imbibed into the recessed surfaces of the cavities in order to improve the ink-receptive property (i.e., the hydrophilic property) of the medium. See p 14, 11 9-25. Consequently, the cell walls are composed of a hydrophobic material that is capable of being fused and the cell floors are hydrophilic, being treated with a hydrophilic coating.

With regard to claims 2-3, Ylitalo discloses that its pattern may be a regular (repeating) or irregular pattern. See p 7, 11 10-11.

With regard to claims 4 and 6, Ylitalo discloses that its cavities comprise hemispherical or cubic cavities. See p 12, 11 10-15.

With regard to claim 5, Ylitalo discloses that its cavities are packed closely together (i.e., at a distance of 10 μm or less). See p 31, 11 17-22. Examiner considers this value to be "substantially no space" between the cavities.

With regard to claim 10, since the cell walls comprise the identical material used by Ylitalo (e.g., polyester), it is inherent the walls possess this property.

With regard to claim 20, Ylitalo discloses that its cavities possess a height and width and volume values (volume) within applicants disclosed values. See p 5, 11 4-5 and 11 20-30. Consequently, it is inherent that the cells, when fused, would provide the claimed overcoat thickness.

With regard to claims 21-23, Ylitalo discloses that its cells comprise materials such as polyesters (a condensation polymer) and polyolefins. See p 13, 11 24-28.

The limitations of the claims are met by the disclosure of the reference.

The claimed ink jet media is particularly adapted to provide improved image quality while at the same time providing ready fusion of the cell walls into a protective layer for the inked areas of the receiver layer. The present amendment serves to insert the limitation of original claim 10 into claim 1. For practical purposes, a fusion temperature of 100°C or above becomes undesirable, especially in a non-industrial environment. From the standpoint of time, capital investment, and energy, higher temperatures are not feasible. In rejecting claim 10, the Examiner has asserted that the fact that the present specification identifies polyester polymers as one useful type of material for the cell walls and the reference also mentions polyesters for such purpose, then the claim is anticipated. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited reference neither teaches, discloses nor suggests fusing the hydrophobic cell network to form a protective layer nor providing such a network that is capable of being so fused. Where heat is discussed by the reference, it is suggested that the embossing or compressing take place at a temperature of 100-200°C (pages 16-17). Thus, there is no suggestion to employ hydrophobic polymers that are fusible at a temperature of below 100°C. Furthermore, the mere fact that both the present invention and the cited reference both suggest polyester polymers as a suitable material does not amount to an anticipation since the range of properties of polymers is wide and the claimed fusion temperature of below 100°C is not implicit in the teachings of the reference polyesters.

The remaining claims depend from claim 1 and are likewise patentably distinguishable from the art since the newly inserted temperature limitation is a clearly distinguishing feature. An allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider withdrawn species claims 8-9 and 11-19. It is believed that these claims are allowable in view of the allowability of claim 1.

Newly represented claim 32 combines original claims 7 and 1 in independent form, providing for the cell walls to be anchored to a hydrophilic layer that acts as cell base. The cited reference describes only cells with a hydrophobic base to which an ink receiver improvement material may be added to the base. This is an alternate embodiment of the invention not shown by the art.

Newly represented claim 33 combines original claims 26 and 1 and is directed to a process for using the media of the invention to form a protective

6

coating by fusion of the cell walls. This is not suggested by the art. It is believed that Applicants are entitled to protection in a single patent for the media and the claimed method of using it.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejection and to pass this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 477-2625
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

FAX RECEIVED
JUN 16 2003
GROUP 1700